



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

passion appears in connection with whatever is stately, whatever is vigorous, whatever is pure" (p. 453).

The book closes with an inspiring working out of the antithesis between the *ought* and the *is*.

London.

F. MELIAN STAWELL.

AN INQUIRY INTO SOCIALISM. By Thomas Kirkup. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Longmans, Green & Co., 1907. Pp. vi, 216.

THE LIBERAL STATE: A SPECULATION. By Thomas Whittaker. London: Watts & Co., 1907. Pp. ix, 202.

Mr. Kirkup's inquiry into socialism is, or should be, too well known to need special or detailed notice. Nothing could be more opportune than the reissue in a substantially unaltered form of this eminently catholic as well as eminently reasonable statement of the socialist case. Socialism is not, in Mr. Kirkup's view, a stereotyped system of dogma, but a regulative idea of industrial organization, depending for its realization on "the irresistible momentum of two great revolutions—the industrial revolution and the political revolution named the new democracy." The aim of socialism is nothing less than to "render the mechanism of the industrial revolution really subservient to human welfare, and to realize a social and economic freedom suited to the political freedom proclaimed in the modern democracy. . . . Like the democracy, socialism aims at the realization of freedom for the mass of mankind." Certainly there is no inquiry into socialism that is better calculated to fulfil the aim the author has set himself—"to bring out what is fundamental in socialism, both as contrasted with the prevailing social system and with theories for which it is usually mistaken."

Among these theories, Mr. Kirkup has anticipated in advance what seems to be a fixed idea in Mr. Whittaker's conception of socialism. By the "Liberal State" is meant a State that "accepts democracy (not necessarily untempered) and intellectual freedom, not as mere temporary phases of a transition, but as permanent elements of an ideal polity. . . . The real opposition to the Liberal State is to be found in a hierarchical or bureaucratic State in which a caste or an order of experts as the representatives of a doctrine govern without systematic control." The

Liberal State is therefore opposed to the Socialistic State, which is regarded as equally inimical to culture and to freedom. "The rulers of the State, according to the very principle of the system, would be its industrial directors; hence the ideals of the State would be more, and not less, stringently commercial than they are now. The individual would be rigorously a portion of the industrial mechanism. His essence would be conceived as efficiency of function in relation to this." It is somewhat surprising that Mr. Whittaker should take this to be the logic of socialism. It is true that certain representatives of what is sometimes called administrative socialism lay so much stress on regimentation that the liberty to be secured by the regimentation seems to "drop out of their reasoning;" but—to take the witness of Mr. Kirkup—"the regimental or bureaucratic socialism which seems to be presumed by some writers, is absolutely alien to any reasonable conception of socialism." On the contrary, "socialism is a type of economic organization that may take form in a thousand diverse ways . . . the type will be always changing; the ideal will always grow more exacting." It is indeed from the point of view both of culture and of freedom that "the claim of socialism to hold the field as a fitting system for the progressive evolution of the future becomes more urgent as time goes on." Mr. Whittaker himself is indirectly a witness to what Mr. Kirkup describes as the "plasticity" and "adaptiveness" of the socialist principle. Socialism is indeed dismissed as involving the suppression of private property and as a direct consequence the suppression of liberty. That is, it is made identical with communism or with what is only a particular and partial method of socialism. All that socialism implies is the collective control of industry for the common good, and for the realization of what Mr. Whittaker calls with truth the ends of life. Mr. Whittaker's own program—the state-control of capitalist industry—is just as much a form of socialism as state-ownership of capital; and it includes not only "systematic state regulation of industry," but "direct curtailment of the possibilities of acquiring social predominance by the accumulation of wealth." Mr. Whittaker seems to think that this conception of "state-direction" "leaves the rights of property in general as they have nearly always been conceived; that is, as subordinated to the commonwealth, not abstract and absolute." Not only is this a somewhat hazardous statement in itself, but surely Mr. Whittaker is taking up what would appear from

his general argument to be an uncongenial attitude of dogmatism and finality when he endeavors to determine *a priori* the kind and degree of "subordination to the commonwealth" that may be demanded in the interest of social welfare from the institution of private property. On the whole, Mr. Whittaker's treatment of socialism seems rather too academic to be particularly pertinent or profitable, though it may serve as a useful corrective of the more abstract and mechanical renderings of the socialist idea that are undoubtedly current.

On the other hand, Mr. Whittaker's defense of the "Liberal System" is full of interest and instruction. It is a rare pleasure to read a book which is characterized by so much distinction both of style and of thought, and combines within a small compass such a variety of fruitful and constructive ideas. Mr. Whittaker selects as his starting point for a political speculation "in which the idea of liberty is supreme" Comte's sketch (in the "Positive Polity") of an ideal society; and the way in which he works out his idea of the Liberal State by selecting the elements of permanent value in the "authoritative" idea of Comte on the one hand and Plato on the other, is particularly interesting. Mr. Whittaker appeals to both popular and philosophical opinion in holding that "justice and freedom" is a better watchword of the State, claiming to be the true organ of humanity, than "order and progress." In the discriminating discussion of "natural rights" full justice is done to the fallacy of the abstract ideal: what is wanted is a reference to a common good—which again must be "a kind of good that is distinctively human and that can be shared." This human and sharable good Mr. Whittaker finds in "culture" as distinguished from material luxury. The political form most fitted for the realization of the human end is the self-governing, national State—"the highest collective form taken by humanity," and "the supreme political problem is to develop it as the basis for the best individual life;" while the social order involves the control of the State over industry—the proper part of the State being to regulate the conditions of employment rather than to be itself the employer of labor. With this general conception, as also with the author's view on the employment of child labor ("the very worst feature of modern capitalization") and his interesting speculation on the endowment of the professions (already outlined in Appendix I to "The Neo-Platonists"), Mr. Whittaker is well within the circle

of socialist ideas. In two concluding chapters Mr. Whittaker considers (rather slightly perhaps, but with considerable freshness and insight) the problem of the State and Religion, and Education. Under the latter head, the conclusion is drawn that a predominating part in the higher education should be given to literature, the reason being that "from nothing else can such a view of the whole be obtained;" while special importance is attached to history (mainly the history of Europe), not only in higher, but also in primary education. This is the kind of political thinking that was never more wanted than it is in these times of dissolving views, and students who desire *multum in parvo* cannot do better than study this sketch of a political ideal "going in some respects beyond the present order, but having its roots in the European past."

St. John's College, Oxford.

SIDNEY BALL.

MAN, THE SOCIAL CREATOR. By Henry Demarest Lloyd. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1906. Pp. 279.

The death of Henry D. Lloyd has removed from contemporary life one of the sturdiest, wisest, and noblest champions organized labor and social reform have had in America. In strength of character, purity of motives, warmth of sympathy, courage of conviction, gentleness of spirit, and power of lucid expression, he reminds one of Henry George. But while he lacked the persuasive eloquence and the capacity for leadership of the great advocate of the single tax, his outlook upon life was broader, his independence of religious and political traditions more complete, and his prophetic insight deeper. Strange as it may seem, his ringing utterances constantly call to mind the great American individualist, Emerson.

This may seem an exaggerated estimate to those who have known Mr. Lloyd only from his studies of the trusts, the co-operative societies in England, and the governmental experiments in New Zealand. What made his "Wealth Versus Commonwealth" so heartily disliked and feared in some circles was the sober, dispassionate manner in which only facts duly attested by court records were introduced to illustrate the growth of trusts. What so endeared him to the rank and file of organized labor was his unselfish devotion to the immediate needs of men, in a strike or a lock-out, as legal adviser, sympathizer, and friend.